UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

LK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/217,873	12/21/98	RAPAICH	M 450.221US1

LM02/0816

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER
& KLUTH
PO BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER
NATNAEL, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2714	

DATE MAILED: 08/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jun 2, 2000* _____ .

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____**3**____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-11* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-11* _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

        ☐ received.

        ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

        ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

1.   35 U.S.C. 102 rejections based on prior art references Anderson et al., (6,028,611) and

Eglit (5,734,362) have been withdrawn. Arguments are considered persuasive, given the amended

language in claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims **1(as amended)2(as amended),3-5,6(as amended),7(as amended),8,9, and**

10(as amended) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hannah, U.S. Pat.

No. 5,568,192 for the reasons record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim **11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eglit, U.S. Pat.

No. 5,734,362 in view of Hannah et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,568,192 and further in view of Music,

U.S. Pat.No. 5,739,861.

Considering claim **11**, Eglit discloses the following claimed subject matter;

a) the claimed processor is met by item 8, fig.2;

c) the claimed main memory is met by item 12, fig.2;

d) the claimed system controller is met by item 22, fig.2

e) the claimed graphics controller is met by item 24, fig.2;

f) the claimed video source is met by item 8 and 12, fig. 2;

g) the claimed video output capable of connecting to a video display device is met by item 40,

fig.2;

      Expect for;

b) the claimed bus.

h) the claimed processor that <u>applies gamma correction to</u> the digital YUV signal provided by the

video source and provides a corrected signal to the video output.

      Regarding b), Eglit doesn't disclose a bus system, however would have been obvious to

include in the reference given that the invention is "provided in the context of Super Video

Graphics Array (SVGA) graphics controller card built according to the Video Graphics Array

(VGA) standard to enable host computer to provide graphic presentation of dat on an LCD

display." (See col. 4, lines 12-15). Generally, SVGA or VGA graphics controller cards are well

known in the art to use a bus system and hook to a PCI or similar bus or interface.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention

was made to readily recognize that a bus system would have been obvious to include in the

reference of Eglit and modify the system of Eglit accordingly, because bus and interface systems

are well known in the art.

Regarding h), Eglit discloses a color space converter 36 that converts YUV date to RGB

data. ~~Eglit doesn't specifically disclose gamma correction~~. *Col 1 does '.* However, it is well known in the art

to have a process of gamma correction either at the camera or at the receiver end to correct for

the linear characteristics. Hanna discloses a gamma correction method to "match typical

computer monitor gammas, as will be understood by those skilled in the art." (See col.6, lines 30-

31). Furthermore, Music discloses a differential order video encoding system that first converts

the RGB values into digital YUV values (see col. 2, lines 48-50) and then gamma corrects (see

col. 6, lines (4-7) using well known in the art techniques. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to readily recognize the teachings of

Hanna and Music and modify the system of Eglit to perform gamma correction, because although

Eglit doesn't specifically disclose gamma correction, it's well known in the art to correct for the

linear characteristics of the camera before the image is sent to the display.

6.   *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's Argument

A) Hannah also discusses a variety of digital signal image processing including gamma correction, but "teaches that this conversion must be performed in the RGB color space"

B) The cited reference does not teach, for example, "a digital processor employing a corrective algorithm that applies gamma correction to the digital YUV signal" as claimed in claim 1, the claims as amended are distinct from the cited reference.

Examiner's Response

A)YUV color space is merely another color space one chooses for gamma correction whereas Hannah et al. chose to utilize the RGB color space. Another person might choose another color space such as YcrCb. The Applicant has not demonstrated why choosing YUV color space is an advantage distinguishing the usage of RGB color space by the prior art reference (Hannah et al.). This is merely a design choice. Thus, this particular argument is considered not persuasive.

B) It is well known in the art that computers use programming algorithms to process data or as in this case to perform color corrections including gamma correction. Hannah discloses that the computer's processor 403 processes the color data and applies gamma correction in the digital domain since the data has been digitized by the A/D converter 412 in circuit 401 as can be seen in Fig.5 and 6. Thus, the argument is considered not persuasive.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to **Paulos**

Natnael whose telephone number is **(703)305-0019**. The examiner

can normally be reached on **Monday through Thursday** from **7:00 a.**

m. to **4:00 p.m.(Est)** The examiner can also be reached on

alternate **Fridays**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Peng,** can be reached on **(703)305-4702.**

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703)305-3900.**

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

      Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

      Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

      (703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for

      entry)

or:

      (703) 308-6296 (for informal or draft communications,

      please label "PROPOSED" OR "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park

II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A. Sixth Floor

(Receptionist).

Paulos M. Natnael

August 7, 2000

MICHAEL LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER